



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,447	02/22/2007	Reijo Pekkala	P18714-US1	9831
27045	7590	02/10/2011	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC.			CHAI, LONGBIT	
6300 LEGACY DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
M/S EVR 1-C-11			2431	
PLANO, TX 75024				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/10/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

Advisory

1. Applicant asserts the prior-art does not teach “to receive a mobile application part message from the first domain, to convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message” because the Office action does not point to any specific portions of the cited reference to support the statement “***the GSM is a truly secured protocol standard***” (Remarks: Page 6 / 1st Para / Line 9 – 13). Examiner notes it is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art having common sense at the time the invention was made to recognize “the GSM is a truly secured protocol standard” – for example (a) both GSM and UMTS apply the same security mechanisms as stated in 3G TS 33.102, v.3.6.0, 3rd Generation Partnership Project, Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects, 3G Security, and Security Architecture, clause 6.8.1.1. (e.g. please refer to U.S. Patent 7,099,675 Column 1 Line 58 – 62 if necessary) and (b) the primary reference “3GPP TS 33.200 V5.0.0 Release 5 March 2002 “ – Section 2 (a reference to 3GPP document including GSM document) and Section 4 (MAP Application Layer Security).
2. Applicant asserts the prior-art does not teach “to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message” because Loganathan **fails to disclose anything about decryption** (Remarks: Page 6 / 2nd Para). Examiner respectfully disagrees because (a) in light of the response to the argument as set forth above “the GSM is a truly secured protocol standard” with respect to *translating the message to a corresponding message in a GSM MAP protocol*, as taught by (Loganathan : Column 4 Line 49 – 52) and (b) the decryption of the message

is indeed extracting an unsecured (or clear – i.e. unprotected) mobile application part message from the received secured (or encrypted) mobile application part message according to the ciphering algorithm agreed by both entities and as such Applicant's arguments are respectfully traversed.

=====

/Longbit Chai/

Longbit Chai E.E. Ph.D
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431
2/3/2011

=====